

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12, 17-25, 27, 30-38, and 40 remain in the application and claims 1, 17, and 30 have been amended hereby. Claims 13-16, 28, and 29 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 12, 17, 27, 30, and 40 under 35 USC 102(e), as being anticipated by Fujimoto.

Features of the information distribution system according to the present invention are that prepaid information (Fig. 8) is recorded in a recording medium loaded by a purchaser in a terminal apparatus (4 in Fig. 1) in an unrewritable manner. The prepaid information includes a prepaid amount of money, a prepaid service ID, and a medium ID. See page 30, lines 17-19 of the present application, for example.

An advantage of this feature of the present invention is that the prepaid information of the purchaser recording medium cannot be tampered with. See page 64, lines 1-3 of the present application, for example.

Independent claims 1, 17, and 30 have been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that Fujimoto fails to show or suggest that prepaid information is recorded in a

purchaser recording medium in an unrewritable manner. Fujimoto clearly teaches that the recording medium is rewritable and that the accounting data is recorded thereon in a rewritable manner. See col. 3, lines 4-9 and col. 16, lines 29-33 of Fujimoto.

Further, what the Office Action in the paragraph bridging pages 11-12 refers to as "unrewritable" is not the purchaser's recording medium, which Fujimoto clearly describes as "a rewritable purchaser record medium" throughout its disclosure, but the software deliverer computer which the purchaser indeed has restricted access to.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 17, and 30, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Fujimoto.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 2, 3, 18, and 31 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fujimoto in view of Akiyama et al.

Claims 2 and 3, 18, and 31 depend from claims 1, 17, and 30, respectively, which rejection over Fujimoto has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Akiyama et al. that somehow could be combined with Fujimoto and result in the presently claimed invention, it is

respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 18, and 31 are patentably distinct over Fujimoto in view of Akiyama et al.


Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 4-10, 19-25, and 32-38 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Fujimoto in view of Akiyama et al. and Inoue et al.

Claims 4-10, 19-25, and 32-38 depend from claims 1, 17, and 30, respectively, with rejection over Fujimoto has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Akiyama et al. and Inoue et al. that somehow could be combined with Fujimoto and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4-10, 19-25, and 32-38 are patentably distinct over Fujimoto in view of Akiyama et al. and Inoue et al.

Entry of this amendment is earnestly solicited, and it is respectfully submitted that the amendments made to the claims hereby raise no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search, because all of the features of this invention have clearly been considered by the examiner in the prosecution of this application and because the present amendments serve only to further define and emphasize the novel features of this invention.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Cooper & Dunham

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Jay H. Maioli", written over a horizontal line.

Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213

Pedro C. Fernandez
Reg. No. 41,741

JHM/PCF:pmc